

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 6 and 8 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 5 and 8 are independent claims. No claims have been amended with this paper. Applicant submits that no the application is in condition for allowance.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 5, 6 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russ et al. ("Russ" U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0068739) in view of Sweatt et al. ("Sweatt" U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0038358). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of the cited references and traverses the rejection.

It is respectfully noted that independent claims 1, 5 and 8 recite "displaying the program data related to the history of the viewed broadcasting programs in a list form." It is further respectfully noted that the Examiner, at page 3 of the Office Action, asserts that Russ discloses "displaying the program data related to the history of the viewed broadcasting programs in a list form" and specifically cites Fig. 8 and paragraph 0045. Moreover, it is respectfully noted that the Examiner, at page 3 of the Office Action, further asserts that "Russ states that the user can view the past history for a predetermined amount of time."

However, it is respectfully noted that paragraph 0045 of Russ discloses "displays the current activity for each of the networked receiving devices." It is respectfully submitted that displaying "the current activity" or "the past history" is not analogous to "displaying the program data related to the history of the viewed broadcasting programs in a list form." It is further respectfully noted that Russ Fig. 8 does not illustrate displaying information "in a list form" but rather illustrates displaying information in a network guide screen form.

It is respectfully submitted that Russ fails to disclose "displaying the program data related to the history of the viewed broadcasting programs in a list form," as recited in independent claims 1, 5 and 8. It is further respectfully submitted that Sweatt also fails to disclose this limitation.

Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that independent claims 1, 5 and 8 are allowable over the cited combination of references. It is further respectfully asserted that claim 6 also is allowable over the cited combination of references at least by virtue of its dependence from allowable claim 5.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1, 5, 6 and 8 of the present application are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as originally filed, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

LEE, HONG, DEGERMAN, KANG & SCHMADEKA

Date: July 29, 2008

By: 

Richard C. Salfelder
Registration No. 51,127
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Customer No. 035884